

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01899 081656Z

62

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 /088 W

----- 040183

R 081610Z APR 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1069

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T USNATO 1899

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: THE COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING: SPC MEETING APRIL 7

REF: A) USNATO 1837 DTG 041321Z APR 75; B) STATE 34467;

C) USNATO 1741 DTG 291515Z MAR 75

1. SPC ON APRIL 7 CONTINUED ITS WORK ON AN "ILLUSTRATIVE" FORMULATION ON HOW COMMON CEILING WOULD BE COMPLIED WITH, BASED ON MERGER OF U.S. AND UK APPROACHES. BELGIUM CONTINUED TO MAINTAIN ITS ALTERNATIVE "TREATY LANGUAGE" FORMULATION.

2. UK REP (BAILES) SAID LONDON PREFERRED A MORE COMPLETE INTRODUCTION OF THE GUIDANCE TO THE OTHER SIDE. THUS LONDON WISHED TO PROPOSE AS A FIRST PARA THE OLD UK PARA (A), MINUS THE REFERENCE TO REDUCTIONS FROM AN AGREED BASE FIGURE, LONDON BELIEVED THAT THE SENTENCE "FOR INFORMATION OF AD HOC GROUP" IN PARA 2, REF A WAS ADEQUATE FROM UK POINT OF VIEW, AND GAVE AHG COMPLETE SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01899 081656Z

TACTICAL FLEXIBILITY. UK ALSO THOUGHT THE SENTENCE QUOTED IN PARA 3, REF A WOULD BE USEFUL IF ANY DELEGATION WISHED IT.

FRG REP (HOYNCK) SAID FRG LIKED THE LATTER SENTENCE. THUS THE UK PROPOSED FIRST PARA WOULD READ AS FOLLOWS: "THE WESTERN/

EASTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WOULD UNDERTAKE TO REDUCE THE AGGREGATE TOTAL OF GROUND FORCE MANPOWER IN THE WESTERN/EASTERN PART OF THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS TO THE AGREED COMMON CEILING FIGURE. AS ALREADY STATED, THE ALLIES ARE WILLING TO CONSIDER A COMMITMENT THAT THE WESTERN CONTRIBUTION TO THE REDUCTIONS WHICH WOULD RESULT IN A COMMON CEILING ON OVERALL GROUND FORCE MANPOWER OF EACH SIDE WOULD INCLUDE REDUCTIONS OF THE GROUND FORCES OF ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS." (COMMENT: MISSION WILL NEED TO KNOW IF THE REMOVAL OF REFERENCE TO AN AGREED BASE FIGURE FROM THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE TEXT JUST QUOTED MAKES IT ACCEPTABLE TO THE U.S., AND WHETHER THE SECOND SENTENCE, AND THE SENTENCE "FOR INFORMATION OF AHG" ON DATA EXCHANGE ARE ACCEPTABLE.)

3. FRG REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES COULD DROP THEIR PROPOSAL OF REFERRING TO "THE WESTERN SIDE" RATHER THAN "THE WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS" (PARA 4, REF A). HOWEVER, IN THAT CASE, FRG WOULD WANT PARA (B) OF THE "ILLUSTRATIVE" FORMULATION TO BEGIN "THE WESTERN/EASTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WOULD JOINTLY UNDERTAKE TO ENSURE ... ETC.", INTRODUCING THE WORD "JOINTLY" IN ORDER TO EMPHASIZE FURTHER THE COLLECTIVE NATURE OF THE COMMITMENT. FRG ALSO AGREED TO DROP THE IDEA OF REFERRING TO "THE WESTERN SIDE" INSTEAD OF "WESTERN PARTICIPANTS" IN THE U.S. PARA (D) RE THE MAILING ADDRESS (PARA 6, REF A). COMMENT: (MISSION ASSUMES INTROCUCTION OF "JOINTLY" IS ACCEPTABLE TO U.S., SINCE WE HAVE ALREADY STATED OUR WILLINGNESS TO CONSIDER JOINT RATHER THAN INDIVIDUAL OBLIGATIONS.)

4. PARA (C) OF THE "ILLUSTRATIVE" FORMULATION/ NOW READS AS FOLLOWS: "THESE COMMITMENS WOULD BE MADE SUBJECT TO AGREED EXCEPTIONS FOR ACCOMMODATING CURRENT MILITARY PRACTICES, SUCH AS ROTATIONS AND EXERCISES."

5. BELGIAN REP (BURNY) NOTED THAT ALTHOUGH HIS AUTHORITIES STILL MAINTAINED THE BELGIAN "TREATY LANGUAGE" ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION, IT WOULD HELP HIS AUTHORITIES WORK WITH THE "ILLUSTRATIVE" FORMULATION, IF THE ALLIES COULD DROP ANY REFERENCE WHATEVER TO COMPLAINT
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 01899 081656Z

PROCEDURE OR MAILING ADDRESS. HE NOTED THE CONCERN WHICH BELGIUM HAD PREVIOUSLY EXPRESSED REGARDING INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF MBFR. MENTION EVEN OF A MAILING ADDRESS TO THE OTHER SIDE COULD PREJUDICE THIS QUESTION, AND COULD HAVE ADVERSE IMPLICATIONS FOR CSCE FOLLOW-ON. HE SAID IT WOULD ALSO HELP HIS AUTHORITIES IF THE ALLIES COULD AGREE TO BEGIN WORK INTERNALLY ON THE MATTERS RAISED IN THE BELGIAN FORMULATION.

6. U.S. REP (MOORE) SAID THAT THE U.S. DID NOT WANT TO GIVE THE OTHER SIDE ANY MORE DETAIL ON FOLLOW-ON OR COMPLAINT PROCEDURE THAN WAS NECESSARY TO SHOW THAT THE COMMON CEILING WAS A WORKABLE CONCEPT. HE NOTED THE NEED FOR THE U.S. PARA (D) REGARDING MAILING ADDRESS IN ORDER TO EXPLAIN TO THE OTHER SIDE HOW THE

COMMON CEILING WOULD OPERATE, AND IN ORDER TO PRECLUDE A SITUATION WHERE SOVIETS COULD COMPLAIN ABOUT CERTAIN FORCE INCREASES WHILE IGNORING COMPENSATING DECREASE ELSEWHERE. HE ADDED THAT THE U.S. DID NOT BELIEVE THAT THE RATHER GENERAL U.S. PARA (D) PREJUDICED THE QUESTION OF CSCE FOLLOW-ON (PARAS 6 AND 7, REF B).

7. UK REP SAID UK COULD NOW AGREE TO DROPPING THE OLD UK PARAS (D) AND (E) ON FOLLOW-ON MACHINERY AND COMPLAINT PROCEDURE. (REF C), AND COULD NOW ACCEPT THE U.S. PARA (D) ON THE MAILING ADDRESS. WITH RESPECT TO BELGIAN INTERVENTION, SHE SAID THAT LONDON, HAVING DROPPED ITS OWN MORE DETAILED FORMULATION, WOULD BE VERY RELUCTANT TO ACCEPT ANYTHING LESS THAN THE U.S. PARA (D).

8. FRG REP ALSO STRESSED THE NEED FOR U.S. PARA (D) ON POLITICAL GROUNDS, AS A WAY OF INSURING AGAINST NATIONAL SUB-CEILINGS.

9. LUXEMBOURG REP (HOSTERT) SAID THAT UNDER INT'L LAW, A PARTY HAVING A COMPLAINT WOULD COMPLAIN TO ALL OTHER PARTIES CONCERNED, AND THEREFORE THE U.S. PARA (D) WAS UNNECESSARY AND PREMATURE. UK REP SAID THAT THAT OBSERVATION DID NOT APPLY TO THE COLLECTIVE COMMITMENT TO A COMMON CEILING, WHICH WAS A NEW SITUATION, REQUIRING A NEW SOLUTION. HOWEVER, ITALIAN REP (SPINELLI) AGREED WITH BELGIAN AND LUXEMBOURG REPS THAT U.S. PARA (D) WAS PERHAPS PREMATURE.

10. U.S., FRG, UK, DUTCH, AND CANADIAN REPS NOTED THE NEED FOR U.S. PARA (D) IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH AHG REQUEST FOR GUIDANCE ON
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 01899 081656Z

HOW THE COMMON CEILING WOULD BE COMPLIED WITH.

11. LUXEMBOURG REP STATED FOR FIRST TIME IN SPC HIS COUNTRY'S READINESS TO PARTICIPATE IN MBFR REDUCTIONS.

12. NEXT SPC CONSIDERATION OF GUIDANCE TO AHG ON THIS ISSUE IS SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 10.

13. ACTION REQUESTED: THE GUIDANCE REQUESTED IN PARAS 2 AND 3 ABOVE. BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 08 APR 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: CunninFX
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO01899
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197504101/abbrzjqf.tel
Line Count: 153
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) USNATO 1837 DTG 041321Z APR 75; B) STATE 34467; C) USNATO 1741 DTG 291515Z MAR 75
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: CunninFX
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 09 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <09 APR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <16 SEP 2003 by CunninFX>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: THE COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING: SPC MEETING APRIL 7
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006